

## **REMARKS**

Responsive to the Office Action mailed March 29, 2010, Applicant provides the following. Claims 1-30 have been amended without adding new matter. Claims 31-33 have been added without adding new matter. Thirty-three (33) claims remain pending in the application: Claims 1-33. Reconsideration of claims 1-30 in view of the amendments above and remarks below and consideration of new claims 31-33 is respectfully requested.

By way of this amendment, Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at (516) 327-2113 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

1. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 20-25, 27, 28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,119,931 (Miyamoto et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,040,920 (Ichiriki), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,219 (Mori).

Regarding claim 1, Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori do not alone or in combination teach or suggest at least "a scanner unit configured to scan a document sheet; a display unit configured to display an image corresponding to the document sheet scanned by the scanner unit; an output unit configured to output the image corresponding to the document sheet scanned by the scanner unit; a control unit configured to cause the scanner unit to scan a first set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a first instruction, and cause the scanner unit to scan a second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a second instruction, and cause the output unit to output the image corresponding to the scanned first set of document sheets and the image corresponding to the scanned second set of document sheets in accordance with

receiving a third instruction; and a display control unit configured to enable the display unit to display, in response to completion of scanning each of plural sets of document sheets including the first set of document sheets and the second set of document sheets, the image corresponding to each of the plural sets of document sheets” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, “a control unit configured to cause the scanner unit to scan a first set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a first instruction, and cause the scanner unit to scan a second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a second instruction, and cause the output unit to output the image corresponding to the scanned first set of document sheets and the image corresponding to the scanned second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a third instruction.” Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori do not alone or in combination teach or suggest at least these limitations of claim 1.

Regarding Miyamoto, Miyamoto teaches the following with respect to the steps illustrated at FIG. 3:

In the case of photocopying process using the ADF 23 (YES on the step S3), after it is determined (in step S4) that all the sheets of original placed on the ADF 23 have been fed to the contact glass and scanned through the scanner 14 (in a step S5), the CPU 11 sets a time-out time 50 to the timer 11a (in a step S6). Simultaneously, the timer 11a starts counting-down operation. Then, when the time out occurs, that is, the timer 11a has finished counting of the time-out time 50 (YES in a step S10), the CPU 11 recognizes that the document has ended. Then, the CPU 11 produces a file list of the copied image data, and transfers the image data to the server apparatus 112 (in a step S11) (Miyamoto, col. 9, ln. 58 to col. 10, ln. 2).

Although Miyamoto teaches the CPU, after recognizing that the document has ended, produces a file list of the copied image data and transfers the image data to a server apparatus, Miyamoto does not teach or suggest at least causing “the output unit to output the image corresponding to the scanned first set of

document sheets and the image corresponding to the scanned second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a third instruction,” as recited in claim 1. That is, while Miyamoto does teach image data corresponding to the recognized document is transferred, Miyamoto does not teach image data corresponding to both a first set of document sheets and a second set of document sheets is transferred in accordance with receiving a single instruction. For at least the above reasons, Miyamoto does not teach or suggest at least these limitations of claim 1.

Regarding Ichiriki, Ichiriki teaches a document storage apparatus having a document storage section which stores a document created by a document creating apparatus and having a plurality of pages by forming the document into an electronic document in which at least one set of image data is stored in page units. When a read demand has been issued from a document reading apparatus, a read demand receiving and analyzing section receives the read demand to analyze the required contents. The required electronic document is, in page units, acquired from the document storage section so as to be processed into a format meeting the required contents by a document processing section. Then, a response data generating section generates response data in which reference information with which page instruction is enabled when a next read demand is issued is embedded. The response data formed in page units is transmitted to a document reading apparatus by a document transmitting section.

As with Miyamoto, Ichiriki also does not teach or suggest at least causing “the output unit to output the image corresponding to the scanned first set of document sheets and the image corresponding to the scanned second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a third instruction,” as recited in claim 1. While Ichiriki does teach transmitting response data formed in page units to a document reading apparatus in response to a read demand, Ichiriki does not teach at least outputting both a first set of document sheets and a second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a single instruction. For at least the above reasons, Ichiriki does not teach or suggest at least these limitations of claim 1.

Regarding Mori, Mori teaches receiving image data from a multi-function peripheral equipment through an interface and a manager program during the execution of a scan and sending the image data to a viewer program, which in turn displays the image data on a screen. However, Mori provides no teaching at least with respect to causing “the output unit to output the image corresponding to the scanned first set of document sheets and the image corresponding to the scanned second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a third instruction,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori do not alone or in combination teach or suggest at least “a control unit configured to cause the scanner unit to scan a first set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a first instruction, and cause the scanner unit to scan a second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a second instruction, and cause the output unit to output the image corresponding to the scanned first set of document sheets and the image corresponding to the scanned second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a third instruction,” as recited in claim 1.

Turning to other limitations of claim 1, claim 1 recites, among other things, “a display control unit configured to enable the display unit to display, in response to completion of scanning each of plural sets of document sheets including the first set of document sheets and the second set of document sheets, the image corresponding to each of the plural sets of document sheets.” Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori do not alone or in combination teach or suggest at least these limitations of claim 1.

Regarding Miyamoto, FIGS. 6-8 and 10-13 of Miyamoto illustrate various screen shots of the display 132 shown at FIG. 4. However, there is no teaching in Miyamoto, either in the figures or the written description, regarding displaying, in response to completion of scanning each of plural sets of document sheets including the first set of document sheets and the second set of document sheets, the image corresponding to each of the plural sets of document sheets.

Regarding Ichiriki, although Ichiriki teaches transmitting response data to a document reading apparatus in response to a read demand from the document reading apparatus, Ichiriki does not teach at least “a display control unit configured to enable the display unit to display, in response to completion of scanning each of plural sets of document sheets including the first set of document sheets and the second set of document sheets, the image corresponding to each of the plural sets of document sheets,” as recited in claim 1. For example, these limitations of claim 1 are at least directed to controlling the display unit to display images in response to completion of operations at the scanner unit. In contrast, Ichiriki teaches transmitting data to a document reading apparatus in response to a demand from the document reading apparatus itself. For at least the above reasons, Ichiriki does not teach or suggest at least these limitations of claim 1.

Regarding Mori, while Mori teaches, during the execution of a scan, sending the image data to a viewer program, which in turn displays the image data on a screen, Mori provides no teaching at least with respect to “a display control unit configured to enable the display unit to display, in response to completion of scanning each of plural sets of document sheets including the first set of document sheets and the second set of document sheets, the image corresponding to each of the plural sets of document sheets,” as recited in claim 1.

For at least all the above reasons, Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori do not alone or in combination teach or suggest at least “a scanner unit configured to scan a document sheet; a display unit configured to display an image corresponding to the document sheet scanned by the scanner unit; an output unit configured to output the image corresponding to the document sheet scanned by the scanner unit; a control unit configured to cause the scanner unit to scan a first set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a first instruction, and cause the scanner unit to scan a second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a second instruction, and cause the output unit to output the image corresponding to the scanned first set of document sheets and the image

corresponding to the scanned second set of document sheets in accordance with receiving a third instruction; and a display control unit configured to enable the display unit to display, in response to completion of scanning each of plural sets of document sheets including the first set of document sheets and the second set of document sheets, the image corresponding to each of the plural sets of document sheets," as recited in claim 1. Thus, Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori do not render claim 1 obvious. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of claim 1 is overcome and should be withdrawn. Claims 2-10 depend on claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of claims 2-10 is overcome and should be withdrawn at least due to their dependency on claim 1.

Independent claim 11 recites substantially similar limitations as discussed above with respect to claim 1; thus the arguments above regarding claim 1 are also applicable to claim 11. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of claim 11 is overcome and should be withdrawn. Claims 12-30 depend on claim 11. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of claims 12-30 is overcome and should be withdrawn at least due to their dependency on claim 11.

2. Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,212,307 (Kanda).

Claims 6 and 9, and claims 16, 19, 26 and 29 depend on claims 1 and 11, respectively, which have been shown above not to be rendered obvious by Miyamoto, Ichiriki and Mori. Kanda provides no further teaching regarding the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the proposed combination of Miyamoto, Ichiriki, Mori and Kanda does not render obvious the invention recited in claims 1 or 11. Thus, at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 11, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26 and 29 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

### **New Claims**

3. Newly submitted claims 31-33 are believed to be allowable because they are directed to that which is not shown or suggested in the prior art. For example, Miyamoto, Ichiriki, Mori and Kanda do not alone or in combination teach or suggest at least all the limitations of any of claims 31-33.

Regarding claims 31 and 32, both of claims 31 and 32 depend on claim 1, which has been shown above not to be rendered obvious by the cited prior art. Thus, claims 31 and 32 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Regarding claim 33, independent claim 33 recites similar limitations as discussed above with respect to claim 1; thus the arguments above regarding claim 1 are also applicable to claim 33. Thus, claim 33 is believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

#### **NO DISCLAIMERS OR DISAVOWALS**

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution.

Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

September 29, 2010

/casey r. huffmire/

Date

Casey R. Huffmire, Reg. No. 60,085  
Patent Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division  
15975 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: 516-327-2113  
Fax: 949-932-3560